



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

A History of Classical Scholarship from the Sixth Century B. C. to the End of the Middle Ages. By J. E. SANDYS, Litt. D. Cambridge, at the University Press. 8vo, pp. xxiv, 672.

Dr. Sandys has undertaken an ambitious task in his History of Classical Scholarship. In two volumes of no very formidable dimensions he plans to cover a subject which embraces a period of more than two thousand years. The indebtedness of the modern to the ancient world for the beginnings of technical scientific literature has been fully set forth in such books as Sachs's *Geschichte der Botanik*, and Cantor's *Geschichte der Mathematik*. But a comprehensive work tracing the fortunes of the great masterpieces of literature from the time of their writing to the present time is still a *desideratum*. Such a book would be in a way the history of culture in the Occidental world, since the interest in, and neglect of, those studies may be taken as an index of the intellectual status of a nation or period. The history of classical scholarship is, moreover, the history of rhetoric and of every branch of scientific linguistic study. But it is too wide a field to be covered with the use of original sources by any one man, and as yet only certain periods have been the subjects of special monographs.

The first volume is devoted to the history of classical scholarship, from its beginnings in the sixth century B. C. to the end of the Middle Ages. It is divided into six books, which correspond to six periods of literary history. An introductory chapter deals with definitions of such words as 'scholarship' and 'philology'. Mark Pattison's definition of a 'scholar' should have been quoted (p. 2) in its final form from his Casaubon, instead of from an early essay, and for the widest conception of 'philology' the latest definition, of Hermann Paul, should have been cited (*Grundr. der germanischen Philol.*, Vol. I, p. 1).

The first book upon "The Athenian Age", is written with an intimate knowledge of the text of the authors treated, and of the literature of the subject. For more than one reason reference should be made to the complaint of Xenophanes (cf. pp. 27, 29), that Homer was so largely used in education (*ap. Herodian*. II 16, 20: ed. Lentz). The omission to note Vahlen's study of Aristotle's quotations is no doubt due to the recentness of its publication (*Berl. Sitzungsber.*, 1902, I, pp. 168ff.). The second book, on "The Alexandrian Age", is a good presentation of one of the most interesting periods of literary history and criticism ;

here the author has had the advantage of the guidance of Susemihl's classic work, but at the same time his treatment shows independent investigation. He has noted the contributions made to Homeric studies by *papyrus* fragments (pp. 133-4), but he does not seem to be acquainted with Blass's important discussion of the value to Platonic textual criticism of *papyrus* readings (Ber. der sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wissensch. Phil. Hist. Klasse L., pp. 197 ff.). In speaking of Philetas of Cos (p. 119), it should have been noted that Plutarch (Pericles, c. 2) selects him, Anacreon, and Archilochus as the representatives, respectively, of iambic, melic and elegiac poetry.

In leaving the chronological order, by dividing the study of the Roman period into the third book, on "Latin Scholarship in the Roman Age", and the fourth book, on "Greek Scholarship in the Roman Age", Dr. Sandys has acted wisely, even if he does not mention the chief reason for such a division. Between the Greek and Latin literatures of the Empire there was a cleavage which was not merely one of language. In Occidental Europe the majority of the patristic writers were apostles of obscurantism, that militant tendency of bigotry and ignorance against the study of the classics. Dr. Sandys, who does not seem to be acquainted with the term, although he notes the existence of such a tendency (pp. 214, 220, 222, 233-4, 594 ff.) does not recognize what an important factor it was in the decline of learning in the West, and there are only bare suggestions of the adoption of classic literary models for the furtherance of Christian doctrine, as in the sacred heroic epic (pp. 216, 234). But the bloom of a flower comes before its decay, and the first chapter of Book IV (pp. 263-272) on the "Roman Study of Greek between 164 B. C. and 14 A. D." should form a part of the treatment of Greek influences on Latin literature, in the preceding book. Dr. Sandys does not lay due emphasis upon the importance, as a movement, of the Pagan Renaissance of the fourth century, in which Ausonius and Symmachus were the principal figures (cf. pp. 206, 209, 214). Again, though the schools of learning, established at the old centres of Greek culture in southern Gaul, never had any but a local influence, which was soon lost under Christian control, they deserve more than the mere mention they receive (p. 233). But altogether too much space is given to Cassiodorus (pp. 244-256, cf. 597), whose works, however valuable they may be to the student of monasticism, and of the political history of the time, offer very little of interest to the historian of classical scholarship. In the East on the other hand, this period deserves an attentive study. It was the age of the rhetoricians, who for centuries kept up a lively interest in the Greek classics, which was not confined to academic circles. This subject has been fully treated in Rohde's great work on the Greek novel (*Der griechische Roman* 2d ed., pp. 310 ff.), a book with which one is surprised to find the author unacquainted (cf. p. 354, n. 2). Amid this general culture

the Christian writers, far from being obscurantists, furnished a fair proportion of celebrities to the literary and learned world. Dr. Sandys has failed to note a matter of great interest in this period, the study of Latin among the Greeks, which was the subject of a study of Egger (*Mémoires de l'histoire ancienne et de la philologie*, pp. 259 ff.), that may be further supplemented by the use of recent material. The best text of the remains of the "chrestomathy" of Proclus (p. 372) is to be found in Kinkel's *Fragmenta Epicorum Graecorum*, 1877, Vol. I.

In the fifth book, which is devoted to the Byzantine period, Dr. Sandys has had the invaluable aid of Krumbacher's epoch-making work, but here again he has added details drawn from his own readings. He has not laid due emphasis on the part played by the Nestorians in translating Greek works into the Oriental tongues (p. 386), and it is hard to see what connection the authorship of the originals of some of the hymns in the English Hymnal has to do with the history of classical philology (cf. pp. 384, 362, 500). Rabe's paper upon the studies in Lucian of Arethas (p. 295) was probably of too recent publication to be accessible (*Gött. Nachrichten*, Phil. Hist. Klasse, 1903, pp. 643 ff.). A first-hand acquaintance with the poem of Michael Acominatus upon the downfall of Athens (p. 412) is worth while, and his description (*Μιχαὴλ Ἀκομινάτου τὰ σωζόμενα*, ed. S. Lampros, 1883, II, p. 44) should be paralleled with similar statements made by visitors to Athens in the same period, collected by Hopf in his *Geschichte Griechenlands von Beginn des Mittelsalters*, etc. (VI, pp. 431 ff.), a work of much more account than the book of Gregorovius.

The date of John of Basingstoke's visit to Athens (p. 413) is generally accepted as 1240 (e. g. Cantor, *Gesch. d. Math.*, 2d ed. II, p. 100). Leo Archpresbyter, who lived not in the first, but in the second half of the tenth century (p. 415), was by no means the first to make the Western world acquainted with the work of Pseudo-Callisthenes upon Alexander. Julius Valerius had already performed that service before the middle of the fourth century, and the Epitome of his work, a composition of the time of Charlemagne, was common in Mediaeval libraries. Fulvio Orsino as the editor, and Peiresc as the owner of manuscripts of the encyclopaedic work of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, should not masquerade in an English book under the Latin forms of their names (p. 397), even if one hesitates to distinguish the editor Valesius from others of the same Latin name, by referring to him as Henri de Valois.

But it is to the last book in this volume that one looks forward with the most interest. For the greater part of this period, covering eight centuries, there is no standard history of literature to be followed as a guide. Therefore an adequate treatment can only be written from a first-hand acquaintance with the works involved, and after collecting and sifting the results of widely

scattered studies on various phases of the subject. That Dr. Sandys does not meet the first of these requisites, is constantly apparent; and his bibliography suffers from faults of both commission and omission. Such an uncritical hodge-podge of facts as Morley's *English Writers*, and such a worthless compilation as Putnam's *Books in the Middle Ages*, are cited as serious authorities, and rubbish from Warton's *History of English Poetry* is quoted in good faith. Such collections as Pertz's *Archiv*, the *Serapeum*, the *Archivio storico italiano*, Hauréau's *Notices et Extraits* are not referred to once; Paris's *Littérature française au moyen âge*, and Steinschneider's *Hebräische Übersetzungen* are cited only two or three times; with the careful use of merely these two books one can correct a hundred misstatements in the text and bibliography. In this section of the volume before us the author has more often fallen into the fault, apparent elsewhere, of confusing a history of classical scholarship with literary history, and bare lists of names, such as that of the English historians who wrote in Latin (pp. 523-4), have a dubious value at all times. With such a wide field to survey, it is only possible to lay emphasis on certain features of Dr. Sandys's treatment.

The knowledge of Greek in the Occident in the Middle Ages was the subject of Renan's doctorate dissertation, which has not, unfortunately, been published, even in part, but to Gidel's study on the same subject in his *Nouvelles études*, Dr. Sandys's indebtedness is very apparent, but he does not show an acquaintance with a mass of other evidence on the matter. Aegidius, who died at the end of the seventh century, and not in 725 (p. 446), was not a native of Athens (G. Paris & A. Bos, *Vie de St. Gilles*, pp. liv ff.); although there is evidence that Greek was a living tongue in Gaul at a much later date (e. g. Gross, *Monatsschrift*, f. *Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Judenthums*, XXVI, p. 68), and upon similar linguistic conditions in southern Italy, there is a mass of material, not utilised by Dr. Sandys (pp. 448, 500, 535, 572 n. 3). He should be acquainted with Gautbert's account of the succession of Greek scholars, beginning with Theodore of Tarsus (p. 449), of which Delisle is the most recent editor (*Not. et Extr. XXXIII*, I, pp. 311-312). If the Bodleian bi-lingual manuscript of the *Acts* (Laud F. 82) is the one from which Bede cites in his *Liber Retractionum* (p. 452), his knowledge of Greek must be somewhat discounted (Berger, *Not. et Extr. XXXIII*, I, pp. 175-176).

In the discussion of the influence of Irish learning on the continent (pp. 441 ff.), Dr. Sandys has not made use of Traube's study of the spread of the Irish script (*Sitzungsber. d. bayr. Ak. Phil. Hist. Cl.* 1900, pp. 469 ff.), nor recognized the value to the subject, of the various researches upon the wide use of the *Canones Hibernenses*. On Virgil of Salzburg (p. 448) reference should be made to White's *Warfare of Science with Theology* (II, pp. 105 ff.), and the best account of Dicuil (p. 449) is to be found in Beazley's *Dawn of Modern Geography* (pp. 317 ff.) As an

authority upon the schools of Charlemagne (pp. 456 ff.) Hauréau's work on the subject should be cited. Salomo's encyclopaedia (p. 479 n. 7) had its source in an abbreviation of the *Liber Glossarum* (Goetz, *Abhd. d. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss.* XIII, pp. 226, 244 ff.). To the latter work Dr. Sandys assigns the generous date of "cent. VIII-IX" (p. 639 n. 3), though it has been definitely attributed to the early part of the eighth century by Goetz (l. c. p. 287). Other misstatements and omissions in the treatment of Mediaeval glossaries and encyclopaedias (pp. 480, 500, 535, 584, 639), may be corrected with the aid of the contributions of Loewe, Usener, Goetz and others. Gerbert was a pupil, not of Odo of Cluni (p. 489), but of the latter's pupil, Scholasticus Raimund. Of Gerbert's works the edition of Olleris should have been cited; and of the *Historia* of his friend Richer, the edition in the *Monumenta*. In the bibliography on the tradition of the millenary year (p. 494 n. 2), there is no reference to the best treatment by Pfister (*Études sur le règne de Robert le Pieux*, p. 322).

The statement that Adelard of Bath "was the first to translate Euclid from Arabic into Latin" (p. 512) needs to be qualified in view of the contributions of Heiberg, Curtze, and others (cf. e. g. *Bursians Jahresber.* XII, 3, pp. 19 ff.; *Zeit. f. Math. u. Phys.* XXXV, Lit. Abt., pp. 48 ff., 81 ff., *Bibl. Math.* 1896, I). The date of the earliest manuscript of the *Gesta Romanorum* is 1342, and not 1326 (p. 524). The list of works attributed to Walter Map (p. 525) needs to be excised. The original Latin versions of the Arthurian romances did not, in all probability, exist outside of the mind of the author of the French versions; and his authorship of the *Apocalypse* and *Confession of Goliath* is more than dubious. If the Goliardic poetry deserves mention, it should be noted that the "*Familia Goliae*" dates back to at least 923 (L. Gautier, *Épopées françaises*, II, p. 43), and reference should be made to the contributions of Delisle, Novati, W. and R. M. Meyer, and others. Joseph of Exeter was the fellow-townsmen and close friend of Thomas Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, and not the brother of Theobald, who had filled the same office thirty years earlier; and the *De Bello Trojano* shows no evidence of an imitation of Claudian (p. 526). The poem on the Fall of Troy, conjecturally attributed by Leyser to Hildebert, was not written by him (Dunger, *Die Sage vom trojanischen Kriege*, p. 22 n.). One speaks, not of Peter of Riga, but of Peter Riga, who was a Frenchman and not a Swede; and one writes Gautier and Alain "de Lille" and not "de L'Isle" (p. 530). It would have been well to be as sceptical as Muratori and more recent scholars of Godfrey of Viterbo's knowledge of Greek, Hebrew, and "Chaldee" (p. 535).

In his account of Latin translations from the Arabic (pp. 539 ff.), Dr. Sandys unfortunately uses as one of his prime authorities the work of Wüstenfeld on the subject, an unsafe guide which

must be controlled and corrected with the aid of Steinschneider's many contributions, to only one of which Dr. Sandys refers, and then incompletely. Further, there is not a single reference to Hauréau's important corrections to Jourdain's *Recherches*. To the list of William of Moerbeke's translations from the Greek (p. 563), should be added those of the mathematical writers, and the fact noted that he found a number of his Greek originals in the Papal library (*Bursians Jahresber.* XXX, 1, pp. 73, 127). No mention is made of the translation of Aristotle's *Economica* made in 1295 by Durand d'Auvergne and two Greek bishops (*Hist. litt.* XIX, 58; *Not. et Extr.* XXXIII, 1, 230) Thomas de Cantimpré should not be mentioned as a translator of Aristotle on the unsupported authority of Trethemius (*Hist. litt.* XIX, 84), and of his *De Naturis Rerum*—in nineteen books instead of twenty—there is such a full account in a recent volume of the *Histoire littéraire* (XXX, 365), that it is not necessary to refer to a bibliographical work, published in 1745. Siger de Brabant most certainly did not write a commentary on the *Prior Analytics*, and there is no evidence that he "expounded the Politics in a revolutionary spirit" (p. 565). Gilles de Paris not only "is the same as Egidio da Roma"; the translation of this Italian name, Gilles de Rome, was the usual name by which he was known in France. And the translation of his work by Hoccleve—better than Occleve—is correctly entitled the *Regiment of Princes*, and not the *Governail of Princes*. Geoffrey of Waterford translated into French, not the Pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *De Regimine Principum*, but another forgery, the *Secretum Secretorum*, into which the *Physiognomica* was incorporated (p. 565).

In the last chapter on the "The Survival of the Latin Classics", one misses references to such works as Kirchhoff's contributions on the Mediaeval book-trade, and Lasch's work on the imitation of classic historians by Mediaeval writers. Levasseur's remarks (*Hist. des classes ouvrières en France*, p. 136 ff.), upon the economic results in Benedictine monasteries of the custom of copying manuscripts, are worth noting. Here and there in the volume there are incidental references to the allegorical interpretation of certain authors; but there is not the definite treatment that the subject deserves. In the earlier books Dr. Sandys has not spoken of its beginnings in pre-Socratic philosophy, its development among the Stoics, its introduction by Philo into the study of the Bible. And in the section under discussion he has failed, on the one hand, to note the important part it played in the change of sentiment towards the classics, which led to that curious fusion of classical mythology and philosophy with Christian theology and ideals, of which Dante is the supreme illustration; and on the other hand, he has not traced its development into that elaborate fourfold interpretation of literature, from the shackles of which, the modern world has to thank the great leaders in the Renaissance for its deliverance. Of the many omis-

sions in the account of the continuance of the classical tradition, only a few can be noted. Boccaccio was acquainted with Lucretius (p. 610); Legouais was not the author of the *Ovide moralisé* (p. 616 n. 4): Statius was not known to Konrad von Würzburg (p. 618),—the *Roman de Thèbes*, by the way, is worth mentioning at this point—the epigrams of Godfrey of Winchester were commonly quoted under the name of Martial (p. 619). The “*Imago Mundi* of Omons” should be excised from the list of encyclopaedic compilations; Omons was merely the scribe of one of the manuscripts of Gautier de Metz’s *Image du Monde*, which is not included in the list (*Hist. litt.* XXIII, 221). In the treatment of formularies of letter-writing reference should be made to Langlois’s important contributions, and to Haskins’s bibliographical note (*Am. Hist. Rev.* VI, 204). Finally it should be noted that Henri d’Andeli, the author of the *Bataille des Sept Arts*, lived in the early, and not in the latter part of the thirteenth century, and was not a canon of Rouen (p. 649); and his work should be cited in the latest edition of Héron.

For the many errors of detail in his treatment of the Mediaeval period, Dr. Sandys has the excuse that he was working in an unfamiliar field, but he has not even used the guides that were available. For instance, he has not made use of Gröber’s sketch of Mediaeval Latin literature, which he mentions in the Preface. In writing the second volume of this work it is to be hoped that the author’s dependence on certain monographs on particular phases of the subject, will not keep him from searching for other material, for which he will have to go even further afield than in writing the section on the Mediaeval period.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

---

Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden. Grundzüge einer oratorischen Rhythmik. Von TH. ZIELINSKI, Professor an der Universität St. Petersburg. Leipzig, Dieterich’sche Verlags-Buchhandlung, Theodor Weicher, 1904, 253 pp. M. 8.40. [Separat-Abdruck aus *Philologus Supplementband IX*, Viertes Heft.]

The artistic employment of rhythm in the composition of prose, more especially, of course, at the end of the period, was an aspect of antique literary art the importance of which it would be difficult to overestimate. The earliest rhetoricians of Greece enforced it by precept and illustrated it in practice, the latest grammarians and critics of the Roman Empire were still busily engaged in the discussion of it, the great prose writers of both Greece and Rome for, at least, a thousand years are examples of its practical application. The so-called *cursus* of the Middle Ages, which emerged after the quantitative system of pronunciation had given way to